

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

In re

CUSTOMS AND TAX ADMINISTRATION  
OF THE KINGDOM OF DENMARK  
(SKAT) TAX REFUND LITIGATION

18-MD-2865 (LAK)

ECF Case

This document relates to:  
Case No. 18-cv-10095(LAK)

**ANSWER OF  
BRADLEY CRESCENZO**

Defendant Bradley Crescenzo (“Defendant” or “Crescenzo”), by and through his attorneys, CAPLIN & DRYSDALE, CHARTERED, as and for his Answer to the Complaint dated June 14, 2018 (the “Complaint”) states as follows:

**AS TO THE PARTIES**

1. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 1, except to admit that SKAT is a taxing authority of Denmark.

2. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the first sentence of Paragraph 2 except to admit that each of the members of Defendant The Skybax LLC 401K Plan (“Skybax Plan”) is a citizen of a state of the United States. Defendant admits the allegations contained in the second sentence of Paragraph 2.

3. Defendant admits the allegations contained in the first sentence of Paragraph 3. Defendant denies the allegations contained in the second sentence of Paragraph 3, except to admit that Skybax LLC, a limited liability company that established The Skybax LLC 401K Plan

(“Skybax Plan”), listed 4 Fieldcrest Road, Westport, Connecticut 06880, in its filings with the State of New Jersey.

**AS TO THE NATURE OF THE ACTION**

4. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 4, except to admit that SKAT is a taxing authority of Denmark.

5. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 5, except Defendant denies participating in a fraudulent tax refund scheme to deceive SKAT.

6. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 6, except Defendant denies participating in a fraudulent scheme.

7. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 7, except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant’s behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

8. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 8, except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant’s behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

9. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 9, except Defendant denies submitting

fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

10. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 10, except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

11. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 11, except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

12. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 12, except Defendant does not have knowledge sufficient to admit or deny allegations with respect to all claimants.

a. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 12.a., except Defendant, upon information and belief, admits that non-party Jonathan Godson ("Godson") communicated on behalf of Skybax Plan regarding the tax refund claims.

b. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 12.b., except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

c. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 12.c., except Defendant, upon

information and belief, denies the allegations that Defendant Skybax Plan did not own shares in Danish companies and had not earned dividends on those shares.

13. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 13.

14. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 14, except to admit that SKAT made withholding tax refund payments for Defendant Skybax Plan, and except that Defendant denies participating in a fraudulent scheme.

15. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 15, except Defendant denies participating in a fraudulent scheme.

16. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 16, except Defendant admits that Defendant Skybax Plan was paid withholding tax refunds.

#### **AS TO JURISDICTION & VENUE**

17. Paragraph 17 alleges legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To the extent that an answer is required to Paragraph 17, Defendant admits that the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, that SKAT is an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state, and that Defendants are citizens of a state, and Defendant denies allegations in Paragraph 17 to the extent they suggest that the Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the matter.

18. Paragraph 18 alleges legal conclusions to which no answer is required.

**AS TO THE FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

19. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 19, except to admit that SKAT is the relevant taxing authority.

20. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 20, except to admit that a certain percentage of dividends is withheld by Danish companies as withholding tax on dividends.

21. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 21, except to admit that under certain circumstances foreign shareholders may be entitled to a refund of the withholding tax.

22. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 22, except to admit that under certain circumstances, U.S. pension plan shareholders may be entitled to a refund of tax withheld on dividends paid by Danish companies.

23. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 23, except Defendant admits that Defendant Skybax Plan submitted withholding tax refund claims and that SKAT paid refunds of the withholding tax, and except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

24. Defendant denies having sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny allegations contained in Paragraph 24.

25. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 25, except Defendant admits that Defendant

Skybax Plan submitted withholding tax refund claims, and except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

26. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 26, except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

27. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 27, except to admit that Defendant Skybax Plan received tax refund payments.

28. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 28.a through 28.e, except to deny submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

29. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 29, except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

30. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 30.

31. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 31, except to admit that SKAT paid withholding tax refunds for Defendant Skybax Plan.

32. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 32, except to deny submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

33. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 33, except to admit that the tax refund claims were submitted on behalf of Defendant Skybax Plan.

34. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 34, except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on behalf of any claimant or otherwise participating in the fraudulent scheme.

35. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 35, except Defendant denies submitting a fraudulent tax refund claim on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in the fraudulent scheme.

36. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the first sentence of Paragraph 36, except Defendant admits that withholding tax refund claims were submitted on behalf of Defendant Skybax Plan.

37. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 37.

38. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 38, except Defendant admits that SKAT made the tax refund claim payments in connection with the tax refund claims submitted on behalf of Defendant Skybax Plan, and Defendant denies submitting false tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

39. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the first sentence of Paragraph 39, except to admit that Defendant incorporated Skybax LLC, and except to deny participating in a fraudulent scheme. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the second sentence of Paragraph 39, except to admit that Skybax LLC was incorporated on January 30, 2014.

40. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the first sentence of Paragraph 40, except to admit he was listed on Skybax LLC's filings with the State of New Jersey. Defendant denies the allegations contained in the second sentence of Paragraph 40, except to admit that 4 Fieldcrest Road, Westport, Connecticut 06880, was listed on Skybax LLC's filings with the State of New Jersey. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the third sentence of Paragraph 40, except to admit that Skybax LLC was dissolved in 2016 and to deny participating in a fraudulent scheme. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the fourth sentence of Paragraph 40, except to admit that at times relevant to the complaint, he incorporated several limited liability companies and performed administrative tasks for several limited liability companies, and except to deny participating in a fraudulent scheme.

41. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 41.

42. Paragraph 42 alleges legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To the extent that an answer to Paragraph 42 may be deemed required and to the factual component of



the allegations, Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 42.

43. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 43 except Defendant admits that non-party Godson communicated on behalf of Defendant Skybax Plan, and except Defendant denies submitting false tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

44. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 44, except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on behalf of any claimants or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

45. Paragraph 45 alleges legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To the extent that an answer to Paragraph 45 may be deemed required and to the factual component of the allegations, Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 45, except to admit that non-party Godson communicated regarding tax refund claims on behalf of Defendant Skybax Plan.

46. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 46.

47. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 47.

48. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 48, except to admit that SKAT paid the tax refund claim payments respect to Defendant Skybax Plan. Defendant denies

having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 48 as it relates to other claimants.

49. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 49.

50. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 50.

51. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 51. Moreover, Paragraph 51 alleges legal conclusions to which no answer is required.

52. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 52, except to admit that Defendant is aware that SKAT erroneously concluded that the tax refund claims submitted by Defendant Skybax Plan were fraudulent.

### **AS TO THE CAUSES OF ACTION**

#### **COUNT I**

##### **(Fraud – Against Both Defendants)**

53. Defendant repeats and incorporates his responses in paragraphs 1 through 52 above.

54. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 54.

55. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 55.

56. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 56.

57. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 57.

## **COUNT II**

### **(Aiding and Abetting Fraud – Against Both Defendants)**

58. Defendant repeats and incorporates his responses in paragraphs 1 through 57 above.

59. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 59.

60. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 60.

61. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 61.

62. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 62.

63. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 63.

64. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 64.

## **COUNT III**

### **(Unjust Enrichment – Against Both Defendants)**

65. Defendant repeats and incorporates his responses in paragraphs 1 through 64 above.

66. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 66.

67. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 67.

68. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 68.

69. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 69.

## **COUNT IV**

### **(Money Had & Received – Against Both Defendants)**

70. Defendant repeats and incorporates his responses in paragraphs 1 through 69 above.

71. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 71.

72. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 72.

### **COUNT V**

#### **(Negligent Misrepresentation – Against Both Defendants)**

73. Defendant repeats and incorporates his responses in paragraphs 1 through 72 above.

74. Paragraph 74 alleges legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To the extent that an answer to Paragraph 74 may be deemed required, Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 74.

75. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 75.

76. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 76.

77. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 77.

### **AS TO THE REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

78. The allegations set forth in the “WHEREFORE” clause constitute Plaintiff’s request for relief to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is necessary, Defendant denies that Plaintiff is entitled to the relief requested, or to any relief.

### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

#### **As A First Affirmative Defense**

79. The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted for the reason that it does not assert a legal theory cognizable as a matter of law and it fails to allege sufficient facts to support a cognizable legal claim.

#### **As A Second Affirmative Defense**

80. The claims are barred by the long-standing doctrine of the Revenue Rule, which prohibits one sovereign from using courts of another sovereign to enforce its revenue laws.

**As A Third Affirmative Defense**

81. The claims alleged in the Complaint are barred by the applicable statutes of limitations.

**As A Fourth Affirmative Defense**

82. The claims alleged in the Complaint are barred in whole or in part by the equitable doctrines of unclean hands, waiver, laches, and estoppel.

**As A Fifth Affirmative Defense**

83. The claims alleged in the Complaint are barred in whole or in part for failure to join indispensable or necessary parties.

**As A Sixth Affirmative Defense**

84. The recovery by the Plaintiff, if any, should be barred because the subject matter of this lawsuit is the subject of another pending legal proceeding.

**As A Seventh Affirmative Defense**

85. Plaintiff's action is barred because of its failure to exhaust administrative and other legal remedies available to it.

**As An Eighth Affirmative Defense**

86. If the Plaintiff suffered any loss, damage, or injury, such damages were caused in whole or in part by, and arose out of, Plaintiff's culpable conduct, including but not limited to contributory negligence and assumption of risk.

**As A Ninth Affirmative Defense**

87. If the Plaintiff suffered any loss, damages, or injury, such alleged injuries and damages were caused, in whole or in part, by the negligence, assumption of risk, fault, and/ or

other culpable parties and/or third parties to this action, other than Defendant, for whose acts or omissions or breaches of legal duty Defendant is not liable.

**As A Tenth Affirmative Defense**

88. The claims alleged in the Complaint are barred in whole or in part by collateral estoppel.

**As An Eleventh Affirmative Defense**

89. The claims alleged in the Complaint are barred in whole or in part because Plaintiff has failed to mitigate its alleged damages.

**As A Twelfth Affirmative Defense**

90. The claims alleged in the Complaint are barred in whole or in part by res judicata.

**As A Thirteenth Affirmative Defense**

91. If the Plaintiff suffered any loss, damage, or injury, such damages are barred in whole or part to the extent such damages have been or will be paid or indemnified by a collateral source.

**As A Fourteenth Affirmative Defense**

92. The recovery by the Plaintiff, if any, should be reduced by application of New Jersey law, including N.J.S.A. § 2A:15-5.3.

**As A Fifteenth Affirmative Defense**

93. The claims alleged in the Complaint are barred in whole or in part by waiver and release.

**As A Sixteenth Affirmative Defense**

94. Defendant reserves the right to add to and/or amend these Affirmative Defenses because of information that may become known during the course of discovery.

WHEREFORE, Defendant respectfully requests a judgement dismissing the Complaint with prejudice, together with his costs, disbursements and attorney's fees and such other further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: New York, New York

July 29, 2019

CAPLIN & DRYSDALE, CHARTERED

s/ Mark D. Allison

By: Mark D. Allison

Mark D. Allison  
Zhanna A. Ziering  
600 Lexington Avenue, 21<sup>st</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10022  
(212) 379-6000

*Attorneys for Defendant  
Bradley Crescenzo*